MINUTES
EGPR STATE AGENCY ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

January 29, 2003
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Technology, Trade & Commerce Agency Building
San Diego Conference Room, 5th Floor

Welcome and Introductions
Terry Roberts, State Clearinghouse Director, Governor's Office of Planning and Research

- On behalf of the OPR Director and myself as the project manager, thank you to all for participating in today's meeting. Thanks also to the Technology, Trade & Commerce Agency for making this meeting room available.
- OPR may be requesting help from state agencies in finding meeting space for future EGPR meetings.
- The EGPR is intended to be a long-range action plan to guide development and preserve our natural resources.
- OPR has a new responsibility to report to the legislature annually on its implementation.
- A draft EGPR will be submitted to the Governor in December 2003.
- Introduction of OPR staff present: Esteban Almanza, Frank Ramirez, Anya Lawler, Bonnie Chiu, Scott Morgan, Todd Feinberg, Sandra Salazar-Thompson.
- Review of agenda and packet contents, which included minutes from the last state agency meeting on December 11, 2002.
- The EGPR is intended to be a policy document for state agencies, not to dictate local actions.
- The mandate to prepare the EGPR is a standing requirement in statute, with the last EGPR published in 1978 (*Urban Strategy*).
- We will work from a clean slate for the 2003 EGPR.
- AB 857 (Wiggins), which was signed last year by Governor Davis, sets out three planning priorities for the state, including: (1) to promote infill and equity, (2) to conserve agricultural land and open space, and (3) to encourage efficient development in areas already planned for growth.
- The EGPR will be the framework for making state policies consistent with respect to these planning priorities.
- By 2005, all state functional plans are required to be consistent with the planning priorities set forth in AB 857.
- The purpose of today's meeting is to listen to state agencies' ideas and suggestions for the scope and content of the EGPR. OPR needs to know about existing state programs and activities that further the three planning priorities of AB 857. For example, we are aware of the Legacy Project within the Resources Agency, the EPIC project by Cal/EPA, the Tri-Agency Partnership, and the Context-Sensitive Solutions program at Caltrans.
- The December 11 State Agency meeting was very useful in identifying how various state agencies might be affected by the EGPR. For example, DHS recognized the potential usefulness of the EGPR to further its mission to protect the health of Californians. Athsma is

a major problem in our state, which is linked to poor air quality, which is one result of our land use and development patterns.

- Every state functional plan must be consistent with both the planning priorities established through AB 857 and the EGPR. The EGPR process is intended to stimulate more collaboration among state agencies. Agencies should work together for more effective implementation of their respective missions.
- The EGPR will hopefully allow the State to speak with one voice to local government and the federal government on issues related to land use, growth, and resource protection.
- OPR is a small office and does not have in-house experts on all of the issues. We want to tap into the expertise of each state agency and department to assist us in understanding the relevant issues and developing policies that are useful and effective.
- OPR does not expect the EGPR to challenge the existing statutory missions of state agencies.
- OPR needs your assistance to focus on the key, fundamental issues that need to be addressed in the EGPR.

Self-Introductions of State Agency Representatives
See attached attendance list.

Recap of 12/11 Meeting and Questionnaire Results
Frank Ramirez, Senior Planner, Governor's Office of Planning and Research

- Minutes of the 12/11 meeting are in the agenda packets.
- Thank you for those of you that participated at our 12/11 meeting.
- The 12/11 meeting consisted of brainstorming of ideas by over 60 attendees.
- Reviewed the list of questions on the questionnaire distributed at the 12/11 meeting.
- OPR received over 51 completed questionnaires.
- OPR is still tabulating the questionnaire results as they are still coming in.
- So far, the answers indicate great interest in the EGPR project.
- The results of the questionnaires will be posted on the OPR web site in the next few weeks.
- The web site will also include information on the EGPR and OPR's process for completing it.

Questions & Answers
Q: Will the questionnaire results be aggregated or specifically broken down by agency?
A: Aggregate.

Q: Will the EGPR process include public meetings?
A: Yes, OPR will hold public workshops. The schedule is being developed, but OPR anticipates the workshops to occur this summer.

Q: How will the Planning Assistance and Advisory Council (PAAC) and other advisory groups be included in this process?
A: Governor Davis' AB 857 signing message indicates that the PAAC will be convened, although we do not know when this will occur. The State Agency Advisory Group and the Stakeholders Advisory Group will meet jointly on February 19 to discuss a draft report outline. Other meetings of both groups are tentatively scheduled every two months through October.

Q: How is the Research Advisory Group comprised?
A: We view this group as our research advisors, much like consultants. We are still formulating and inviting members to this group, but essentially we hope to have six or seven key advisors who will make sure that we are aware of the most current and accurate research to inform the EGPR. In addition, there will be numerous other researchers whom we will contact and interview on an as-needed basis. The Research Advisory Group is intended to point us to current data and analyses and make sure that we don't overlook important information.

Q: Is OPR also interested in out-of-state research, documents, or processes that may be relevant to the EGPR?
A: Yes, definitely. We are already reviewing policy documents from other states and welcome additional suggestions.

Q: How is it that OPR staff have smiles on their faces when they're faced with such a challenge as the EGPR? And what about the reality of the population growth problem in California?
A: It is an overwhelming task, but we are very positive and aiming high because this is a project of a lifetime for most planners. We can manage this project if we focus the EGPR on some fundamental problems that we can effectively tackle. We believe the State can do a better job of influencing growth than is the case now.

Q: The biggest "land mine" in this project is local government (control of land use). What is your take on this?
A: The EGPR can greatly influence decision-making at the local level. The EGPR will guide state funding and will clearly articulate a uniform set of goals and policies at the state level. We believe this will ultimately influence local land use decisions.

Q: How is OPR going to produce a report outline by February?
A: OPR staff is reviewing the input from the State Agency Advisory Group and the Stakeholders Advisory Group and has done substantial background research. All of the input we have to date will be reflected in a draft EGPR outline that will be discussed at the February 19 meeting. We fully expect that the outline will be revised as a result of the meeting.

Q: What does conflict resolution mean? Does it mean "I lose, you win"?
A: No, we don't believe that is what it means. The conflict resolution process, which is mandated in AB 857, is being developed by OPR, but that is separate from the development of the EGPR.

Visioning Exercises
Anya Lawler, State Clearinghouse Policy Advisor, Governor's Office of Planning and Research

Meeting attendees were seated in small groups to brainstorm answers to two questions:

1. What is the greatest threat or the most troublesome trend facing California over the next 20-30 years? What can the State do to lessen or eliminate the threat or reverse the trend?
2. What is the most important opportunity California must grasp now or lose within the next 10 years? What can the State do to seize that opportunity?

Groups were not asked to reach a consensus, but rather were asked to put anything and everything on the table. Attendees were also asked to take off their "hats" as agency representatives and respond to the two questions independently. After an hour of facilitated discussion, each table briefly reported back on the points discussed within their small group. Each group took notes on easel pads; the following is a transcription of those notes.

TABLE #1

Threats / Trends
- Population growth
- Rich poor gap
- Diversity—holding on to culture/difficult communication
- Housing shortfall
- Water
- Power
- Traffic
- Air pollution
- Low political participation. Elected officials or electorate not representative of whole population. Who gets heard?
- Balkanization
- Divisiveness/me first
- Conflict resolution
- Zero sum thinking (win/lose)
- Fiscal Instability
- Tax System
- Term limits—legislators on constant campaign mode
- Fiscalization of land use
- Sprawl versus new town

Opportunities:
- Ways to monitor trends and show results of current lifestyles (Sim City, advertisements)
- Educate public for lifestyle changes
- Graphic examples: seatbelts and anti-smoking programs
- Provide financial incentives
- Propose legislation—general plan law and guidelines, and infill to expand state control
- Water: show where water will come from for all land use (surrogate for growth debate); adjudicate ground water
- Implementation

What Can State Government Do:
- Systems to deliver infrastructure and ways to pay
- Control what state funds—if you (locals) build where state (and locals) agree, then get State money and infrastructure
- Tighten local land use controls by modifying state land use law.
- Identify what money state does control?
- Education verses transportation

- Water
- Money controls legislation, decision authority

TABLE # 2

Threats/Trends
- Economic and population growth—How do we handle? How do we balance?
- Lack of coordination for state's resources (i.e. water, energy)
- How the state is aligning itself to satisfy long-term energy needs (i.e. oil, ag practices, distribution)
- Pursue hydrogen infrastructure
- Climate change
- Lack of affordable housing
- Nexus of jobs, housing, and transportation systems
- Quantity/quality of jobs
- Workforce training is starting to move away from in-demand employers
- Air quality trends—better in urban areas, not as good in rural areas

Opportunities:
- Energy situation is just a glimpse of what is to come. If we do not act now, we will be worse off down the road; demand responsive
- Economic downturn can be an opportunity for evaluating long-term goals
- Every year, as committees grow, we miss more opportunities to plan growth in a coordinated manner
- Long-term planning to satisfy H_2O demands across demands (i.e. residential, ag…)
  - ➢ Examine the definition of demand to make sure it captures proper meaning
- State has opportunity to set standards and priorities to lead by example
  - ➢ Or, may send wrong note to local government as the EGPR and similar activities appear.
- Given budget situation, good time to look at local government's control over own affairs
- Scarcity is promoting an opportunity to establish regional cooperation
- Scarcity→ look at better sources of information/real-time information

What Can State Government Do:
- Enforcing laws that impact all levels of government
- State vision on how to employ current benefits (i.e. resources) and leverage for solving problems over long term
  - ➢ Coordinate planning and resources for all levels of government
  - ➢ Multi-level/strategic planning/partnering both across government and with government partners
  - ➢ Integrate goals/mitigate challenges of all state agencies and departments in a common vision
  - ➢ Public awareness/education

TABLE #3

Threats/Trends

- Global climate change
- Transportation systems/energy use land use patterns around transportation system
- H_2O Supply/ availability
- Outdoor air quality
- Indoor air quality
- Electric generation systems impact
- Electric generation systems reliability
- Energy system pricing impacts
  - Energy manipulation—money drained from California
- Impacts of use of energy
  - Power sources→ pollution
- Adverse consequence of population growth, too many bodies
- Housing availability/demand
- Health care availability/access
- Community acceptance of forensic clients
- Infrastructure, e.g. toxic mold, co-gen. plant, and air quality
- Financial responsibility of aging systems/closure plans
- Water quality/ water sharing w/locals
- Transfer/ sell-off of properties regarding water sheds to private sector
- Family/client needs to remain in community vs. real estate needs (eg, turn over property).
- Fate of hazardous waste from DDS facilities.
- Competition for resources—e.g. water, land—for various purposes.
- Resource usage becoming more consumptive
- Road infrastructure land usage-highest growth area impact on biological hot spots→ habitat fragmentation
- Air quality impacts on all activities
- Move toward inland development
- Action within state→international impacts
- Low income housing going to land such as wetlands
- Water supply, distribution and access
- Impact of population and diversifying population on infrastructure
- Diversification of population
  - Sheer numbers
  - Distribution of numbers with in state
- Need for localized discussion regarding diversification and other aspects of EGPR
- Power dynamics re planning
- Environmental justice
- Congregation of populations—choice
- EJ and location of facilities in communities. Same as low-income housing
- EJ and local acceptance of certain facilities, e.g. power plants
- Role of farming/ farm land in development
- Pervasive gangs—worst problem per YACA

Opportunities/What Can State Government Do:
- Give regional governments tools to make better decisions, e.g. useful data re-growth and general plans
- Very strong state planning, e.g. EGPR
- Relationship among various reports/documents (infrastructure report, 5 year capital outlay, EGPR)
- Regional local governments to conform with statewide plans… if locals want state funded amenities
- Figure out how state can focus resources to urban areas (schools, housing—tie to EJ guidance—degree and quality)
  - ➢ Relate to scope of EGPR
- Provide incentives for who people want to live in higher-density areas
- Deploy state resources to regional governments to improve management of resources – improve their role as intermediary with counties
  - ➢ Offer them carrots for better planning
- Cross-training of state agency staff to learn beyond their own programs.
- Strong policy direction ⇒ influence locals
- Provide training
- Make monies available to local government, e.g. energy efficient planning
  - ➢ Need money for these programs—usually a lower priority.
  - ➢ How much does government really support this type of activity?
- Willingness to address global climate change
- Unprecedented amount of bond $ for natural/green infrastructure

TABLE # 4
Threats/Trends
- Changing Demographics and resultant gaps—income, age, ethnicity
- Water: availability and quality
- Natural resources
- Energy
- Lack of data / knowledge, science
- Lack of collaboration—different department, different priorities
- Crumbling infrastructure: replacement & new
- Access to services: healthcare, social security—lack of access
- Air quality & impacts on health
- Agriculture—conservation, sustainability
- Development driven by desire for quick money
  Competition for money—local governments
- Allocation of money
- Unstable revenue streams
- Housing—lack of, affordable
- Environmental justice
- Fiscal constraints
- Flexible funding by state for local projects (solution)

Opportunities:
- Continue to improve education
- How do we (state) provide funding and what services state provides
- Collaboration/cooperation among state agencies
- Open to changing laws, regarding state agency actions and infrastructure
- Overall access to information potential through technology to help us better plan to avoid unfortunate surprises (GIS)
- Use Technology to educate and resolve conflicts (video conferencing)
- Private/public partnerships: state help facilitate partnerships and problem solving
- Develop opportunities to provide services to the changing population where the people are. Changing demographics need changes in services distribution
- Volunteerism—healthy senior population needs to be tapped.
- Use technology to reduce the use of natural resources.
- Create more incentives to conserve natural resources
- Create opportunities for people to be more self-sufficient (walking, riding, environmentally sensitive)
- Take advantage of more transportation alternatives
- Take advantage of funding opportunities for alternative transportation

What Can State Government Do:
- Demographics—be aware, knowledge
- Be prepared to involve different stakeholders
- Be able to adjust how you deliver services and where
- Explore how, what works and doesn't
- Better access to information
- State become more of a broker of information and best practices.
- Partnerships—more and new
- Leverage financial incentives
- Water/natural resources:
  - Knowledge information broker
  - Continue and improve funding of infrastructure
  - Providing resources to folks that need them, un-funded communities
- Grant training across the board
- Improved/increased enforcement (water, air, etc)
- Conservation standards—enforcement of
- Teach kids about being/seeing the big picture.

Large Group Discussion
The last part of the meeting was a large group discussion in response to the following questions: How can the EGPR be useful to your agency? How can your agency best contribute to the success of the EGPR?

RESPONSES

- In order to get the EGPR both written and implemented, the Governor should issue an executive order telling agencies that it is a high priority.
- EGPR can serve as an impetus for getting state functional plans together and helping coordinate. Can help coordinate departments within an agency and stimulate interagency coordination
- The EGPR is needed to create a stable, coherent planning environment in which state agencies can get projects built. Currently they get "ping-ponged" around by different requirements and policies.
- The value of having the Health and Human Service Agency's 14 departments and boards engaged in the EGPR process is that they all deal with issues around environmental health and health and social services access, all of which are an important part of the conversation around land use and planning. Services need to be where the people are, and people need choice in their services. Location and urban design impacts people's access. Isolated populations are harder to serve, which impacts their quality of life and puts a burden on service providers.
- Need to keep in mind the different needs of aging population and what this means in terms of health services, housing, transportation, etc.
- GIS (geographic information systems) is an important tool to add value to EGPR at each stage (development and implementation). Use GIS to make information tangible in the EGPR. Increase the public awareness of the availability of services through technology. GIS can improve both state and local planning and decision making.
- Need State support and authority behind breaking barriers to infill development so that it can happen on a significant level. We talk about infill a lot, but aren't removing the barriers. It's easier to say where development can't go than to ensure that infill is supported.
- Work on clearly identifying areas where development should be discouraged. Don't be ambiguous about where the State should stay away.
- Multi-agency side—develop work plans through multi-agency meetings to implement EGPR
- Need to make sure there is a clearly defined "it" in the EGPR. What is "it" that state government needs to get behind and support and that agencies will need to implement? How do we get to "it"?
- What do we as state entities want?
- EGPR should propose models for better collaboration and conflict resolution between state agencies and local government for deciding where growth should go. Example: Riverside County RCIP
- Strengthen local general plan directives, and not just in the *General Plan Guidelines*. Need to reconcile transportation and housing elements.
- State needs a balance of both direction and directives on how future planning should take place.
- Identify exactly where infill should occur and how much. Do research to quantify the infill potential of major urban areas. (It was noted that this is a difficult task and that there is no single definition of "infill")
- Calculate the redevelopment potential of existing developed areas and promote redevelopment.

- Need to fill in the gap between the general plan process (and other planning processes) and environmental justice. Non-planners need education on how planning processes work, but planners also need to be educated about why certain issues are important to people.
- Need strong leadership for the EGPR to succeed.
- The Governor needs to back up the EGPR with budget/funding decisions that support the three planning priorities.

Meeting Attendees

Baker II	Mitchell	Department of Transportation
Bornstein	Julie	Department of Housing & Community Development
Buxton Benouar	Katie	Department of Transportation
Cross	Barbara	Department of Water Resources
Curry	Christina	Office of Emergency Services
Ferrera	John	Business, Transportation & Housing Agency
Gates	Kimberly	Health and Human Services Agency
Glickfeld	Madelyn	Resources Agency of California
Grandy	Douglas	Department of General Services
Green	Stephen	Youth and Adult Correctional Agency
Hansen	Stephen	State and Consumer Services Agency
Hanson	Nancy	California Energy Commission
Hazelroth	Stanton	Technology, Trade and Commerce Agency
Marr	Robert	Employment Development Department
Maul	David	California Energy Commission
Minton	Jonas	Department of Water Resources
Noda	Audrey	Business, Transportation & Housing Agency
Rodriguez	Richard	Health and Human Services Agency
Seeley	Ann	Department of Health Services
Streigel	Jack	Department of Mental Health
Strem	Charlotte	University of California
Wagstaff	Bruce	Department of Social Services
Wheaton	Linda	Department of Housing & Community Development
Yee	Doug	Department of Development Services
OPR Staff		
Almanza	Esteban	
Chiu	Bonnie	
Feinberg	Todd	
Lawler	Anya	
Morgan	Scott	
Ramirez	Frank	
Roberts	Terry	
Salazar-Thompson	Sandra	